

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/616,868 | 07/10/2003 | Dominique Rigal | 8076.294USW1 1456 | | |
| 23552 MERCHANT & | 7590 02/13/2007 & GOULD PC | | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 2903 | | | NOBLE, MARCIA STEPHENS | | |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1632 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 02/13/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/616 969 | RIGAL ET AL. | | | |
| Notice of Abandonment | 10/616,868 Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 7. MAN NO DATE (11) | Marcia S. Noble | 1632 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | lears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| This application is abandoned in view of: | | | | | |
| Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 30 June 2006. (a) A reply was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of month(s)) which expired on (b) A proposed reply was received on, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection. | | | | | |
| (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (| n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ard Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); | mendment which places the | | | |
| (c) A reply was received on but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below). | | | | | |
| (d) ⊠ No reply has been received. | | | | | |
| 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85). (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of | | | | | |
| Allowance (PTOL-85). | | | | | |
| (b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due. | | | | | |
| The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$ | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received. | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37). | | | | | |
| (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply. | | | | | |
| (b) No corrected drawings have been received. | | | | | |
| 4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the applicants. | e attorney or agent of record, the ass | signee of the entire interest, or all of | | | |
| 5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. | | | | | |
| 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims. | | | | | |
| 7. The reason(s) below: | | | | | |
| Applicant's Representative, Katherine Kowalchyk, was constacted by telephone on 2/1/2007 to confirm that the case is intended to be abandoned. A voicemail was left explaining that the case is about be abandoned and if this is not the intent of Applicant, Ms. Kowalchyk should contact examiner within 24 hours. No return phonecall was received. Therefore, it is assumed that the case was intended to be abandoned. | | | | | |
| | | MARIE FALK, PH.D MARY EXAMINER | | | |
| Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdr | aw the holding of abandonment under 37 | CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to | | | |